



## Environmental Management Consolidated Business Center (EMCBC)

### Subject: Pegasus Users Guide

Program Description

APPROVED: (Signature on File)

EMCBC Director

ISSUED BY: Office of Logistics Management

---

#### 1.0 PURPOSE

This user guide has been written in a manner that will allow for those sites that are serviced by the EMCBC (i.e., those sites with a Service Level Agreement) to also adopt this system. Therefore, the remainder of the user guide will identify EMCBC/SLA when referencing applicability. This user guide identifies responsibilities and establishes several of the steps used with Pegasus for reporting the results of assessments and managing associated issues and actions including corrective and preventive actions, as applicable.

(NOTE: The EMCBC Assessment Program is established in Reference 4.2.4 EMCBC Oversight and Assessment Procedure.)

#### 2.0 SCOPE

This user guide describes the process used by select organizations within the EMCBC to identify, validate, document, and distribute an Assessment, Audit, or Surveillance of EMCBC work activities and processes and for Small Sites Project level contractor work activities assessed by EMCBC. The guide is also used for DOE EMCBC self assessments at the Federal Project level for those sites choosing to use it. This guide is also used for internal tracking and disposition of issues and actions that require tracking to completion.

#### 3.0 APPLICABILITY

This user guide applies to EMCBC user organizations adopting the Pegasus System.

#### 4.0 REQUIREMENTS AND REFERENCES

##### 4.1 Requirements

- 4.1.1 PL-226-01, EMCBC Oversight Plan
- 4.1.2 PL-414-01, EMCBC Quality Assurance Program
- 4.1.3 PL-442-01, EMCBC FEOSH Plan

4.2 References

- 4.2.1 DOE G 414.1-5, *Corrective Action Program Guide*
- 4.2.2 IP-361-01, Training and Qualification
- 4.2.3 IP-230-01, Operating Experience/Lessons Learned
- 4.2.4. IP-414-02, EMCBC Oversight and Assessment Procedure
- 4.2.5. IP-243-04, File Plan Creation and Maintenance

5.0 DEFINITIONS (See also IP 414-02, Attachment H for a more comprehensive list)

- 5.1 Pegasus System - The term used to describe an EMCBC Office of Logistics management systems used to track and close issues, actions, assessment activities and corrective actions.
- 5.2 Issue – An issue is derived and input from assessment reports (both contractor and self assessments) and are primarily concerned with identifying problems or opportunities for improvement. Issues may be Deficiencies, (non-compliances with requirements), strength(s) or observations that are identified in Pegasus when writing assessment reports. Issues are provided to the EMCBC Assistant Director's of the Line Organization assessed or the Federal Project Director of the Small Site assessed for further action and or assignment of Corrective Actions or Lessons Learned.
- 5.3 Action – Actions are tasks or assignments given to staff. Actions track things such as responsible person, due date and deliverables. Actions can be assigned to issues, correspondence, feed-back, lessons learned or be stand alone.
- 5.4 Alerts – Pegasus allows users to sign up for automatic alerts, via email for example, when new actions are assigned to the user, when an existing action is reassigned or when a correspondence is assigned to a user.
- 5.5 Deficiency (Also known as a Finding) – A problem or condition which does not meet specified requirements and represents either: (1) a systemic failure to establish and/or implement an adequate program or control; or (2) a significant failure which could result in unacceptable impact on the safety of personnel, the facility, the general public or the environment; or (3) a failure to meet mission programmatic requirements as assigned by the EM guidance, directives etc; or (4) a Quality Criteria QC-1 Non-compliance. The Line Management determines if a concern or group of concerns constitutes a deficiency. Recommendations from the Assessor(s) may be considered in the determination.

- 5.6 Feedback – Pegasus contains a Feedback module. The module allows users to document issues, concerns or suggestions regarding “system bugs”, enhancements or new module requests.
- 5.7 Lessons Learned – The Pegasus System has a Lessons Learned (LL) module that allows users to incorporate and/or attach LL to reports or assessments.
- 5.8 Newspaper – The Pegasus System provides a Newspaper which is the first page of the Pegasus database. It is a summary of database records in the system (for the user and the user’s organization) that it believes may pertain to the user. The news system provides a quick and easy way to navigate to the user’s data, i.e. actions, assessments, reports etc.
- 5.9 Observation – A problem or condition that is of a concern to Line Management but does not meet the definition of a deficiency. Contractor weaknesses do not require a formal Corrective Action Plan (CAP), but are tracked by the DOE Line Management via Pegasus to assist with identifying trends or deficiencies. DOE Line Management Observations do not require a CAP.
- 5.10 Relationships – The Pegasus System has the ability to allow any record to be linked to any other record. For instance, a correspondence may come in that requires an assessment and six separate actions. All of these records can be linked together using the relationship manager.
- 5.11 Strength – An accomplishment or capability that exemplifies the effective, efficient execution of work performance and exceeds requirements.
- 5.12 Document Management – The Pegasus System has the ability to track/store documents with every Pegasus record. Multiple files can be linked to a single database record, for example pictures can be attached to reports, verification documents like training rosters can be attached to actions or CAP’s etc.

## 6.0 RESPONSIBILITIES

### 6.1 EMCBC Director

- 6.1.1 Ensure the implementation of the EMCBC Assessment Program.
- 6.1.2 Designate the Manager of the DOE EMCBC Oversight Program.

### 6.2 EMCBC Assistant Director, Office of Logistics Management

- 6.2.1 Plan and budget for travel funding to support Project level assessment activities.

6.2.2 Provide technical resources to support Project level assessment activities.

6.3 EMCBC Assistant Director of Contracting

6.3.1 Ensure Contracts include the requirement for DOE Oversight of Contractor Assurance Systems.

6.3.2 Ensure DOE Support Service contracts refer to using the applicable DOE Oversight systems used by or at the supported site.

6.4 Manager of the Program (Team Leader, Compliance and Project Support, Office of Logistics Management)

6.4.1 Plan and direct Office of Logistics assessment staff efforts and actions.

6.4.2 Identify Pegasus issues that require the development of new or modified policies, procedures or guides.

6.4.3 Maintain knowledge of project and contractor activities to make informed decisions about hazards, risks and resource allocation in support of assessment activity.

6.4.4 Ensure operating experience is used to assess trends and safety issues that may have bearing on the safety and success of DOE operations.

6.4.5 Maintain the Pegasus Users Guide, tutorials and help pages and provide Pegasus Training to end users.

6.5 EMCBC Assistant Director, Office of Technical Services

6.5.1 Provide technical assistance to the Federal Project Director, as requested.

6.6 Federal Project Director (FPD)

6.6.1 Ensure the development, implementation and maintenance of an effective project oversight program to evaluate contractor compliance and performance according to the provisions of their contracts.

6.6.2 Ensure the adequacy of contractor assurance systems.

6.6.3 Develop assessment schedules and reviews with the Integrated Project Team (IPT) members and the EMCBC Office of Logistics Management, Compliance and Project Support Team.

6.6.4 Recommend and provide staff members to perform as observers, technical specialists, assessors or auditors.

6.6.5 Coordinate personnel interfaces and access, as required, for assessment performance.

6.6.6 Review assessment plans.

6.6.7 Review and approve oversight reports.

- 6.6.8 Use the results of oversight and contractor assurance systems to make informed decisions about corrective actions and the acceptability of risks and to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of programs and site operations.
- 6.6.9 As appropriate, delegate responsibilities to Sub-Federal Project Directors.
- 6.6.10 Approve Contractor level Corrective Action Plans developed as a result of DOE line management oversight.
- 6.7 EMCBC Assistant Directors (Only those using Pegasus as their self assessment tool)
  - 6.7.1 Reviews, concurs and approves Issues, Actions, Self-Assessment Reports, and Corrective Action Plans within their areas of cognizance and responsibility as presented/assigned through the Pegasus.
  - 6.7.2 Ensures EMCBC management is kept apprised of the status of open issues and actions.
  - 6.7.3 Monitors the status of organizational open issues via Pegasus.
  - 6.7.4 Analyzes EMCBC Organizational self-assessment results to identify trends and potential problems or opportunities for improvement. Initiates actions necessary to prevent or correct negative trends and/or problems or to take advantage of opportunities for improvement.
  - 6.7.5 Ensures EMCBC staff receives training commensurate with responsibilities.
- 6.8 Assessment Team Leader (ATL)
  - 6.8.1 Refer to Section 8.3.3 of IP 414.02, Oversight and Assessment Procedure.
  - 6.8.2 Ensure required Fields in Pegasus are completed in order to schedule and track assessments. (See Section 8 under “Lead Assessor”)
- 6.9 Assessment Team (IPT Members, Subject Matter Experts, Facility Representatives and/or Contracted SME or Technical Resources)
  - 6.9.1 Prepare assessment checklists.
  - 6.9.2 Conduct assigned portions of the assessment.
  - 6.9.3 Assist in completion of report preparation.
  - 6.9.4 Attend assessment-related meetings.
  - 6.9.5 Review Contractor Corrective Actions resulting from assessment activity and provide DOE line management with recommendations regarding acceptability consistent with the project specific CAR process.

6.10 EMCBC Staff (Includes EMCBC and Project level staff utilizing EMCBC Pegasus products and services)

- 6.10.1 Perform assessments in accordance with Reference 4.2.4 and document all assessment activities and results in accordance with this procedure.
- 6.10.2 Serve as a first level of review/approval in the CAP validation process described in this procedure (Or the specific site CAP process/procedure).
- 6.10.3 Respond to Pegasus issues and actions assigned by the cognizant Assistant Director or first line supervisor and document the results or actions assigned in accordance with this procedure.
- 6.10.4 Prepare corrective actions and/or CAP's as assigned to them for Federal Weaknesses and Deficiencies.
- 6.10.5 Notify their Assistant Director or first line supervisor immediately of conditions requiring prompt corrective action.

7.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

7.1 Operational Awareness Activities

*DOE line management, primarily through field organizations, must conduct routine day-to-day monitoring of work performance through facility tours/walk-throughs, work observations; document reviews, meeting attendance and participation, and ongoing interaction with contractor workers, support staff, and management.*

- DOE line management must rigorously review and critique contractor processes and performance in identifying, evaluating, and reporting events and safety issues that are required to be reported by laws, regulations, or DOE directives to determine whether issues are properly screened, evaluated, and reported.
- DOE line management must evaluate and monitor the contractor evaluations and corrective actions for events and issues and assesses whether effective recurrence controls are identified and implemented.
- Operational awareness activities must be documented either individually or in periodic (e.g., weekly or monthly) summaries. Pegasus provides DOE staff the ability to record operational awareness activities as a "Type 3" assessment.
- Deficiencies in programs or performance identified during operational awareness activities must be communicated to the contractor for resolution through a structured issues management process, which are typically managed and communicated to the contractor by the DOE line management field organization.

7.2 Assessments of Facilities, Operations, and Programs

*DOE line management must establish and implement assessment programs to determine contractor compliance with requirements. (See also, Reference 4.2.4, Assessment Procedure for Federal Employees)*

- Deficiencies (Findings) identified by DOE assessments or other DOE reviews are addressed in a structured issues management process. DOE verifies that contractor corrective actions are complete and effective in addressing deficiencies before they are closed out in the issues management system.
- DOE line management must maintain a baseline assessment program that provides assurance that DOE managers have an accurate picture of the status and effectiveness of site programs and that deficiencies are identified in a timely manner. The EMCBC uses Pegasus to establish and document the baseline and track and document deficiencies.
- Oversight includes structured and rigorous processes for validating the accuracy of information collected during assessments. DOE line management requires that findings must be tracked and resolved through structured and formal processes, including provisions for review of corrective action plans.
- DOE line management must verify that corrective actions are complete and performed in accordance with requirements before findings identified by DOE assessments or reviews are closed, and requires that deficiencies are analyzed both individually and collectively to identify causes and prevent recurrences.
- EMCBC staff and resources may be utilized to support Small Site Line Management Assessments.

7.3 Assessments of Contractor Assurance Systems

*DOE requires that contractor assurance systems address all organizations, facilities, and program elements.*

- For sites where contractors report the results of performance measures to DOE (e.g., as part of a contractual provision), DOE must regularly assess the effectiveness of processes for collecting, evaluating, and reporting performance data to ascertain the accuracy, completeness, and validity of the performance measures. Small Sites may choose to use the Pegasus system for this purpose.

7.4 Evaluations of Contractor Performance

*As contracting officers, DOE line management must periodically evaluate contractor performance in meeting contractual requirements and expectations.*

- DOE Line Management has the direct responsibility for contractor oversight. The EMCBC and the Pegasus System may be adopted by Small Sites to assist in Line Management Oversight. EMCBC technical resources may also be utilized to support DOE Line Management Oversight.

7.5 Self-Assessments of DOE Line Management Functions and Performance

DOE Headquarters and field organizations must have a structured, documented self-assessment program for environment, safety, and health; safeguards and security; cyber security; emergency management; and business operations to comply with DOE requirements. DOE organizations must perform self-

assessments of programmatic and line management oversight processes and activities (e.g., security surveys, facility representative programs, personnel qualification standards, and training programs) to assess whether requirements and management expectations are met. The frequency of assessments of these functions must be commensurate with the hazards and risks related to the activity being assessed. Continuous improvement mechanisms (e.g., corrective action processes) must be in place to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of oversight programs and site operations.

- EMCBC staff and resources will be tasked to conduct EM Line Management Assessments of Small Site as a component of EM Line Management Oversight. The activities will be conducted under the direction and in coordination with the Office of Site Support and Small Projects, EM-3.2.

## 8.0 USER GUIDE STEPS

### 8.1 Scheduling and Tracking Assessments

The following table provides instructions for making use of selected fields in the Contractor Assessment Data Entry screen and the Self Assessment Data Entry screen.

<b>(From the New Assessment Screen) Scheduling and Tracking</b>		
<b>Pegasus Field</b>	<b>Instructions for Assessment of Contractor</b>	<b>Instruction for EMCBC Self Assessment</b>
Site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Select the site the Assessment will be completed for from the drop down list. If not listed, select other.</li> <li>• This is important so that routing for review and approval can be done correctly.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as Contractor Assessment</li> </ul>
Assessment Type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any number or none may be selected</li> <li>• Responsible to the Lead Assessor for completing assigned portions of the assessment.</li> <li>• Not authorized to mark assessment complete even though it shows up on their Newspaper page.</li> <li>• Will receive credit for the assessment in the EMCBC Performance Indicators.</li> <li>• Reference 4.2.4 (Section 7) provides definitions and discussion of assessment types</li> <li>• Click the “More Info” link for descriptions and definitions of the assessment types.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as Contractor Assessment</li> </ul>



Lead Assessor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Responsible for completing the assessment.</li> <li>Only person who can mark the assessment complete</li> <li>Responsible for briefing the applicable FPD/COR and requesting they submit the report to the Contractor</li> <li>Typically assigned by the FPD of the organization being assessed.</li> <li><b>NOTE*</b> If not yet identified at initial scheduling or the employee is not an EMCBC employee, Select Other and specify in the comments section. Notifications regarding this assessment will default to the EMCBC OLM Compliance and Project Support Team Lead</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Responsible for completing the Assessment</li> <li>Only person who can mark the assessment complete</li> <li>Typically Assigned by the AD of the organization leading the assessment.</li> </ul>
Team Members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Select all that apply</li> <li>Drop down list only includes EMCBC, Cadre and Select Project Staff.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as Contractor Assessment</li> </ul>
Performed By	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Select the Organization you are assigned to. This will ensure the action shows up on the correct newspaper page.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Select the Organization you are assigned to. This will ensure the action shows up on the correct newspaper page.</li> </ul>
Subject	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This field should describe what is to be assessed and where, if applicable</li> <li>Examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MOAB Emergency Management Program</li> <li>WVDP ISMS Annual Verification Review</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This field should describe what is to be assessed and where, if applicable</li> <li>Examples <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EMCBC Office of Logistics Personal Property Review</li> <li>MOAB QA Assessment</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Scheduled Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Yes” means the EMCBC or Project Line Management made the assignment and the subject, start and finish dates can only be modified by management (May or may not be part of the Master Assessment Schedule)</li> <li>“No” means that the Lead Assessor has full control over the subject, start and finish dates.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as Contractor Assessment</li> <li><b>NOTE</b> A “Yes” check is important for EMCBC planning and resource loading purposes. A “Yes” check helps ensure the assessment is scheduled with adequate lead time and should be used for rolling three (3) year cycles.</li> </ul>
Master Assessment Schedule	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Yes” means that the assessment has been credited in order to ensure that Line Management MAS is met. The following restrictions apply: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment cannot be deleted</li> <li>Start/Finish can be modified or cancelled by the appropriate</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as Contractor Assessment</li> </ul>

	<p>EMCBC or line management (Note: decisions to delay or cancel MAS assessments should take into consideration the impacts on the MAS and personnel/ resource considerations)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ All MAS assessment are by definition Scheduled Assessments</li> </ul>	
Applicable Projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Select or identify any Project(s) that were reviewed during the assessment</li> <li>• Pegasus uses this information to track progress towards meeting Oversight requirements. It is therefore important that selections/information be accurate</li> </ul>	Not Used
Facilities Covered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a list of facilities that require coverage in accordance with DOE-STD-1063-2006 or are further identified by DOE line Management</li> <li>• Pegasus uses this information to track progress towards meeting Oversight requirements. It is therefore important that selections/information be accurate</li> </ul>	Not Used
Functional Areas Reviewed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Select all that apply</li> <li>• Pegasus uses this information to route assessment results to the applicable FPD. It is, therefore, important that selections/information be accurate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Select all that apply</li> <li>• EMCBC uses this information to route assessment results to the applicable AD/FPD. It is used to evaluate and demonstrate compliance with DOE 226.1 Oversight requirements. It is therefore important that selections/information be accurate and complete.</li> </ul>
Master Assessment Plan Elements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Select all that apply</li> <li>• Pegasus uses this information to track progress toward meeting EMCBC and DOE Line Management goals in Oversight.</li> <li>• Click the “MAP Element Definitions” link for more information on descriptions and definitions of the individual MAP elements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as Contractor Assessment</li> </ul>
Time Spent on Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include all spent preparing, researching, and conducting the assessment. Do not include time spent writing the report</li> <li>• Pegasus uses the information to calculate the average time spent for assessment type. This, in turn, has an</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as Contractor Assessment</li> </ul>

	impact on the calculation of risk adjusted work hours required to meet line management oversight commitments.	
--	---	--

## 8.2 Writing and Managing Assessment Reports

- 8.2.1 All assessments require Reports be linked to them. This includes Type 1, 2, and 3 assessments identified in Reference 4.2.4. The IAMS automatically tracks and reports on the status of Reports on the Newspaper.

The following table provides instructions for making use of selected fields on the Contractor Report Data Entry screen and the Self Assessment Report Data Entry screen.

<b>Writing and Managing Assessment Reports</b>		
<b>Pegasus Field</b>	<b>Instructions for Assessment of Contractor</b>	<b>Instruction for EMCBC Self Assessment</b>
<b>Lead Assessor</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Responsible for writing and publishing the Assessment Report and any associated issues.</li> <li>Recommends issue significance (Deficiency/Finding, weakness, strength, observation) for <b>Line Management</b> review.</li> <li>This person, along with the person in the “Entered by” field is authorized to make entries in the Report data entry screen and advance the Report status.</li> <li>For Contractor Assessments with Issues, responsible for briefing the applicable FPD and requesting they submit, i.e. finalize the report to the Contractor.</li> <li>For external assessments with Contractor related issues (i.e DOE-HSS, DNFSB etc.), responsible for entering report and any associated Issues (separately) in IAMS.</li> </ul>	Same as Contractor Report
<b>Status</b>	<p>This field is used to “advance” a Report and if applicable, associated Issues from the initial draft stage through finalization and publication, as described below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft – no one but the Lead Assessor and the person in the “Entered By” field can view the report.</li> </ul>	<p>This field is used to “advance” a Report and if applicable, associated Issues from the initial draft stage through finalization and publication, as described below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft – no one but the Lead Assessor and the person in the “Entered By” field can view the report.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pending Review - when satisfied that the Report package is factually accurate and complete, the Lead Assessor selects this label (and Saves) to open the report for general access by all Pegasus users.</li> <li>• Final – this label can be applied by one of the two methods described below. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Method A - For any assessment with no Issues identified (i.e. a Fac Rep walkthrough with no deficiencies), the Lead Assessor will select Final in the Status and then Save. Once Final is selected, the user is asked to click the “Finalize” button on the right.</li> <li>○ Method B – For any assessment with Issues identified (i.e. Deficiencies/Findings requiring Corrective Actions), the FPD will need to review the Report (and the associated issues). Once reviewed and accepted, the FPD will select Final in the Status and then Save. Once Final is selected, the user is asked to click the “Finalize” button on the right.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pending Review - when satisfied that the Report package is factually accurate and complete, the Lead Assessor selects this label (and Saves) to open the report for general access by all Pegasus users.</li> <li>• Final – this label can be applied by one of the two methods described below. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Method A - For any assessment with no Issues identified (i.e. DOE self assessment with no deficiencies), the Lead Assessor will select Final in the Status and then Save. Once Final is selected, the user is asked to click the “Finalize” button on the right.</li> <li>○ Method B – For any assessment with Issues identified (i.e. Deficiencies/Findings requiring Corrective Actions), the appropriate organizational AD/FPD will need to review the Report (and the associated issues). Once reviewed and accepted, the AD/FPD will select Final in the Status and then Save. Once Final is selected, the user is asked to click the “Finalize” button on the right.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Assessment Type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference 4.2.4 (Section 7) provides definitions and discussion of assessment types</li> <li>• Click the “More Info” link for descriptions and definitions of the assessment types.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as Contractor Assessment</li> </ul>
Site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Select the site from the drop down list where the assessment occurs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Select the site from the drop down list where the assessment occurs.</li> </ul>
Assessing Organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This should be the organization the assessor is assigned to. This will ensure that Organizational Newspaper page is updated accordingly.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as Contractor Assessment</li> </ul>
Subject	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This field should describe what was assessed, where, when.</li> <li>• Examples <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Operational Readiness Review of the UDS Project, June 2008</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This field should describe what was assessed, where, when.</li> <li>• Examples <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ EMCBC Federal Technical Capabilities Training Review</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Fac Rep Walkthrough of the HFBR Project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Fac Rep Certification/Re-certifications</li> </ul>
Executive Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This field should be used to provide a concise overview of the assessment including any conclusions</li> <li>• The nature of the information should make it a candidate for direct communication to the affected organization or Contractor by DOE line management.</li> <li>• The information in this field should fully support the “Depth of Assessment” and “Overall Impression” determinations described below.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This field should be used to provide a concise overview of the assessment including any conclusions</li> </ul>
Depth of Assessment	<p>This field is meant to describe how completely the subject was reviewed in order to put its results in an appropriate perspective. For example, more weight would generally be given to an Issue that came from a Comprehensive Assessment than from a Shallow one. Depth of Assessment is a subjective determination that may be indicated by time spent, experience, and length of report. The following guidance is offered to assist in determining the Depth of Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shallow – The subject matter is skimmed rather than reviewed in-depth. The assessment involved minimal effort and time (compared to a thorough or comprehensive review). Reports for shallow assessments are generally only one or two paragraphs long.</li> <li>• Thorough – The subject matter was researched beyond its immediate application. For example, an entire document/procedure might be reviewed for adequacy instead of only a section applicable to a specific activity or operation. A moderate to high level of time and effort was put forth during the assessment in order to go beyond what was immediately observable. This type usually takes hours of work and may involve a great amount of writing and research. Reports generally range from several paragraphs to several pages.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as Contractor Assessment</li> <li>• Additional information on Assessments can be found in Reference 4.2.4.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comprehensive – The subject matter was researched to the level of understanding federal requirements and/or industry standards. The assessment required a large investment of time and effort, and the report is several pages long. (The above guidance can be found online by clicking the “More Info” link.)</li> </ul>	
Overall impression	<p>This field is meant to provide a subjective overall scoring of assessment results. The following guidance is offered to assist in determining Overall impression:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unacceptable – This option indicates that there were severe and/or numerous issues associated with the assessment. If this option is selected, there should be at least one deficiency/finding or multiple weaknesses cited.</li> <li>Marginal – This option indicates that there were minor or trivial problems associated with the assessment. If this option is selected, there should be at least one observation or weakness noted or the report should indicate which problems were fixed on the spot.</li> <li>Meets Expectations – This option indicates that everything went as expected with no significant problems. If no issues are cited, this should be the default selection.</li> <li>Exceeds Expectations – This option indicates the assessment went very well and that contractor/operator performance was better than expected. Often times, this category will cite a proficiency either in the report or as an issue (strength).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as Contractor Assessment</li> <li>Additional information on Assessments can be found in Reference 4.2.4.</li> </ul>
Activities Observed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describe any activities observed during the assessment. Include where and when, as applicable; this information is often important to the end user of the report</li> <li>May be left blank if not applicable</li> </ul> <p><b>NOTE</b> Thorough and Comprehensive Reviews will require entries in this field</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as Contractor Assessment</li> <li>Additional information on Assessments can be found in Reference 4.2.4.</li> </ul>
Interviews Conducted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List any personnel (by position/title</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as Contractor Assessment</li> </ul>

	<p>only, not names) interviewed during the assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include date of interview</li> <li>• May be left blank in N/A</li> </ul> <p><b>NOTE</b> Thorough and Comprehensive Reviews will require entries in this field</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional information on Assessments can be found in Reference 4.2.4.</li> </ul>
Documents Reviewed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• List any documents reviewed, including revision numbers/letters, reviewed during the assessment.</li> <li>• May be left blank is N/A</li> </ul> <p><b>NOTE</b> Thorough and Comprehensive Reviews will require entries in this field</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as Contractor Assessment</li> <li>• Additional information on Assessments can be found in Reference 4.2.4.</li> </ul>
Assessment Details including Fact Gathered.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This field should be stand alone and should fully document the results of the assessment</li> <li>• This field <b><u>must</u></b> include factual statements that support any associated Issues and the Overall impression.</li> <li>• It is helpful to list facts as stand-alone statements or items that can be readily copied to the Issue Factual Basis field, as applicable (See Writing and Managing Issues section on this procedure for additional information.)</li> <li>• For external assessment reports, if feasible, copy and paste the external report into this field. Otherwise, it is acceptable to paste in a summary of the external report and attach and reference the full text version.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as Contractor Assessment</li> </ul>
Applicability of MAP Elements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This field serves as a reminder and second check for Report Writers to ensure that selected MAP Elements are discussed in the Assessment Report. Failure to identify the MAP Elements will not provide objective evidence of coverage of the issues/elements.</li> <li>• This field auto-generates based on the MAP Elements selected during the “New Assessment” data screen. If additional MAP Elements are identified after the Report is entered (on either the Assessment or Issue data entry screens), use the “Refresh” button to recopy the MAP Elements in this field.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as Contractor Assessment</li> </ul>
Steps Taken to Ensure Factual	Describe the actions taken to ensure accuracy and completeness of the facts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as Contractor Assessment</li> </ul>

Accuracy	presented in the report. This description should be specific as possible, but remember to use titles instead of names.	
----------	--	--

### 8.3 Writing and Managing Issues

8.3.1 With regard to Issues Management, the EMCBC employs a graded approach to determine the need for preventive and/or corrective action as described below:

- Federal Observation Issues automatically close when submitted in the self assessment report. Corrective Actions may be added and tracked to closure; however they are not formally validated and verified.
- Federal Weaknesses require an approved Corrective Action Plan (CAP) and are tracked and verified closed. Causal Analysis (in accordance with Reference 4.2.4), may be performed but is not required.
- Federal Deficiencies require root cause analysis and an approved CAP that both corrects the deficiency and addresses causal factors in order to prevent recurrence. Federal Deficiencies are tracked and verified closed.
- Contractor Issues approved by the responsible line management (FPD) will always need to be transmitted to the contractor via the FPD or the COR. Pegasus does not directly communicate to the Contractor.

**NOTE** – DOE G 231.1-2, Occurrence Reporting and Performance Analysis Guide provides Root Cause Analysis Guidance.

8.3.2 Issues are only generated and identified through the Report Writing process in Pegasus. The Organizational Line Management Official (either an AD or FPD) responsible for the Issue is required to review the draft report and if agreeing with the report, change the status of the report to “Final”.

8.3.3 The EMCBC also utilizes a “Feedback” link in Pegasus. The link may be used by EMCBC and Serviced Site employees to provide feedback and suggestions for Quality Management System enhancements and improvements. These suggestions are periodically reviewed by EMCBC management and action is taken as needed to improve the QA Program and/or prevent potential quality problems. EMCBC Management provides feedback to staff regarding suggestions and any resolutions.



<b>Writing and Managing Issues</b>		
Pegasus Field	Instruction for Contractor Issues	Instructions for Federal issues
	<b>From the Contractor Report screen, click “Add Issue”</b>	<b>From the Self Assessment Report screen, click “Add Issue”</b>
Issue Number	This number is automatically generated but can be overwritten if desired. For example, if an external assessment produces numbered Findings, those numbers may be used to avoid having to crosswalk between this system and the external numbering system.	Same as Contractor Issue
Issue Owner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EMCBC or Serviced Site point - of-contact for the Issue.</li> <li>• The Issue Owner defaults to the Lead Assessor but may be reassigned by EMCBC/FPD management.</li> <li>• Generally, this person is also the Assigned Validator for the CAP and the Assigned Verifier for Issue closure.</li> <li>• The Issue Owner is responsible for tracking and closing Weaknesses as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 60 days after their publication, Pegasus will display Weaknesses that need follow up.</li> <li>○ The Issue Owner is responsible for reviewing field conditions and any actions taken by the Contractor to address Weaknesses. Results of the follow up will fall into one of three options <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Weakness resolved. Document result in Comments Section on the Issue data entry screen, set the status to “Closed” and enter date Closed.</li> <li>2. Weakness still being worked. Document current status in Comments Section of the Issue data entry screen and come back later.</li> <li>3. Weakness is unresolved and not being worked. Decide whether or not the Weakness merits reissue as a Deficiency. If so,</li> </ol> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responsible for developing the Corrective Action Plan (CAP) and fixing the problem, if applicable.</li> <li>• The Issue Owner defaults to the Lead Assessor. However, EMCBC Procedures and policy prohibit assessors from reviewing their own work, so for internal self assessment, the true Issue Owner will almost always be someone other than the Lead Assessor. The Issue Owner determination is made by EMCBC/Project Line Management during the management review process.</li> <li>• For Federal Weaknesses and Federal Deficiencies Only: Responsible for advancing the CAP through the validation process as described in the Managing Corrective Action Plans table below.</li> <li>• Note that, since the Issue Owner is responsible for developing the CAP, they are <b><u>never</u></b> the validator of the CAP or Verifier of Issue Closure.</li> <li>• Note, also, that the Issue Owner can add Actions to Federal Observations and even Federal Strengths, as desired. These Actions do not require validation and are therefore not controlled as a CAP.</li> </ul>

	<p>close it indicating in the Comments Section that it is being upgraded to a Deficiency. Otherwise, close the Weakness annotating it “overcome by events” or leave it open and work with Contractor to move toward closure.</p>	
Responsible Organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Select the EMCBC Organization or Project Site generally most interested in the issue. For example, if the Office of Logistics is leading a Project level QA assessment of the Projects Contractor, the Project Site should be chosen.</li> <li>• Pegasus uses this tag to determine which organizational Newspaper to display the Issue status to.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as Contractor Issue</li> </ul>
Issue Statement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concise statement of the problem or proficiency; a conclusion statement only. The details and supporting facts go in the Factual Basis field below <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Example: The SPRU configuration management system has been ineffective in controlling equipment drawings</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Additional guidance on writing Deficiencies is provided in Attachment 6.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concise statement of the problem or proficiency; a conclusion statement only. The details and supporting facts go in the Factual Basis field below. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Example: The Project Line Management has not specifically identified oversight required by higher level directives.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Requirements Not Met	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Required for Deficiencies and Weaknesses; optional for negative Observations; N/A for Strengths and positive Observations.</li> <li>• If used, must include a reference to the requirement (e.g. DOE Order citation, S/RID, internal procedure number and paragraph, etc.) AND a brief synopsis of the requirement that was not met. <b>Note:</b> At the FPD’s discretion, an Issue may be categorized as a Weakness without a Requirement Not Met.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preferred but not required for Federal Deficiencies and Weaknesses; N/A for Federal Strengths and positive Observations.</li> <li>• If used, must include a reference to the requirement (e.g. DOE Order citation, internal procedure number and paragraph, etc.) AND a brief synopsis of the requirement that was not met.</li> </ul>
Factual Basis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Copy a few of the strongest facts from the Assessment Details (on the Report screen) sufficient to enable a reader to reach the conclusion in the Issue Statement. (It is usually not necessary</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as Contractor Issue</li> </ul>

	<p>to list all the facts gathered in this field.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should not be new facts here that were not documented in the Report</li> </ul>	
Actual/Potential Consequences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use this field to explain the significance of the Issue</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as Contractor Issue</li> </ul>
Recurrence Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a clear, complete, and stand alone analysis in this field. Line Management’s decision regarding Issue type is often influenced by the contents in this field. Provide all information needed to understand the uniqueness, recurrent or repeating nature of the issue without the need for additional documents or records.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as Contractor Issue</li> </ul>
Issue Type	Refer to Section 5 of this procedure for definitions for Deficiencies, Observations, Weaknesses and Strengths.	Issues written against DOE line management (to include Project Offices) are prefaced with “Federal” but are otherwise defined the same as Contractor Issues. Refer to Section 5 of this procedure for definitions used for Deficiency, Observations, Weaknesses and Strengths.
Functional Areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Select all that apply.</li> <li>• Pegasus uses this information to route assessment results to the applicable Functional or Line Management Organization for consideration in monthly performance analysis. It is therefore important that these selections be accurate and complete.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Select all that apply.</li> <li>• EMCBC/Line Management uses this information to route assessment results to the applicable Functional or Project Line Management Organization for consideration in monthly performance analysis. It is therefore important that these selections be accurate and complete.</li> </ul>
Applicable MAP Elements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Select all that apply.</li> <li>• Pegasus uses this information to track progress toward meeting DOE EMCBC/Project Line Management Oversight requirements. Inaccurate information may lead to a false belief that an element has been covered when it actually has not. It is important that these selections be made accurate and complete.</li> <li>• Click the “More Info” link for descriptions and definitions of the individual MAP Elements</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as Contractor Issue</li> </ul>

Applicable Projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Select any Project(s) associated with the issue.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as Contractor Issue</li> </ul>
Facilities	This is a list of Project Level facilities that require coverage in accordance with DOE-STD-1063-2006. This field is rarely filled.	N/A to DOE facilities, i.e. Bldg 55, Springdale etc.)
Apparent Cause	<p>Not used here. Contractors would complete this based on their root cause analysis.</p> <p><b>NOTE*</b> Contractor Root Cause Data may be entered if available.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Select all that apply.</li> <li>See Attachment 7 of DOE G 231.1-2, Occurrence Reporting and Performance Analysis Guide for various causal factors listed.</li> </ul>
Assigned Verifier	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For Contractor Issues, this field is only applicable for Deficiencies.</li> <li>Generally, this is the Issue Owner. The Assigned Verifier and Management Verifier can be the same line management official.</li> <li>Responsible for verifying closure of a Deficiency when submitted as closed by the Contractor. To verify an Issue as closed               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>View the Contractor submittal for closure to verify the actions are completed. If applicable, the documents can be scanned and saved as part of the Record.</li> <li>Use any combination of evidence review and field verification to ensure that the corrective actions have been completed and have effectively resolved the Deficiency.</li> <li>Click the “Verify” button on the Issue data entry screen, type in a justification, click either the “Closure Verified” or Closure Rejected” button, as appropriate. This action automatically advances the Issue to the next step in the closure verification process.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This field applies to both Federal Weaknesses and Federal Deficiencies.</li> <li>Generally, this is the Issue Owner. The Assigned Verifier and Management Verifier can be the same line management official, if desired.</li> <li>Responsible for verifying closure of a Deficiency when notified of by Pegasus (or other means) of their closure by the Issue Owner.</li> <li>To verify an Issue as closed               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use the View Actions button on the Issue data entry screen or the Pegasus Navigation System to review the set of Corrective Actions.</li> <li>Use any combination of evidence review and field verification to ensure that the corrective actions have been completed and have effectively resolved the Issue.</li> <li>Click the “Verify” button on the Issue data entry screen, type in a justification, click either the “Closure Verified” or Closure Rejected” button, as appropriate. This action automatically advances the Issue to the next step in the closure verification process.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>
Management Verifier	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For Contractor Issues, this field is only applicable to Deficiencies</li> <li>Responsible for the second tier closure verification of Deficiencies submitted as closed by the Contractor. The</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This field applies to both Federal Weaknesses and Federal Deficiencies.</li> <li>Generally, this is the Issue Owner. The Assigned Verifier and</li> </ul>

	<p>Management Verifier should ensure that the Assigned Verifier has made a sufficiently thorough review of closure evidence and adequately justified their closure determination. If the Management Verifier's selects a verification conclusion that differs from the Assigned Verifier's conclusion, the Issue remains unverified and is returned to the Assigned Verifier's queue for follow up with the Manager.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Assigned Verifier and Management Verifier can be the same Manager, if desired.</li> <li>• To verify an issue: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. View the Contractor submittal for closure to verify the actions are completed. If applicable, the documents can view via Pegasus if scanned and attached to the record.</li> <li>2. Use any combination of evidence review and field verification to ensure that the corrective actions have been completed and have effectively resolved the Deficiency.</li> <li>3. Click the "Verify" button on the Issue data entry screen, type in a justification; click either the "Closure Verified" or Closure Rejected" button, as appropriate. This action automatically advances the Issue to the next step in the closure verification process.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<p>Management Verifier can be the same line management official, if desired.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responsible for verifying closure of a Deficiency when notified of by Pegasus (or other means) of their closure by the Issue Owner.</li> <li>• To verify an Issue as closed <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Use the View Actions button on the Issue data entry screen or the Pegasus Navigation System to review the set of Corrective Actions.</li> <li>2. Use any combination of evidence review and field verification to ensure that the corrective actions have been completed and have effectively resolved the Issue.</li> <li>3. Click the "Verify" button on the Issue data entry screen, type in a justification; click either the "Closure Verified" or Closure Rejected" button, as appropriate. This action automatically advances the Issue to the next step in the closure verification process.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>
--	---	---

#### 8.4 Writing and Managing Corrective Action Plans

- 8.4.1 EMCBC Line Management and Serviced Site Federal Project Directors utilizing the Pegasus System do not use the Management Assessment Report/Management Self Assessment Report format originally developed for Pegasus. Rather, the Line Management Officials use the Reports Menu and routinely, usually weekly review the reports for the status of CAP's, Actions and Issues.
- 8.4.2 Pegasus automatically generates a CAP record (placeholder) for each finalized Contractor Deficiency and each finalized Federal Weakness and Federal Deficiency and assigns a due date 60 calendar days from the date the applicable Report is "Finalized".

**Note** Contractor Deficiencies that require Corrective Action Plan(s) to be developed must be communicated to the Contractor through the FPD or the applicable COR.

Writing and Managing Corrective Action Plans		
Pegasus Field	Instructions for Contractor CAPs	Instructions for Federal CAPs
Assigned Validator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is usually the Issue Owner</li> <li>This individual is notified by Pegasus or other means, when a Contractor CAP is submitted for validation.</li> <li>To validate the CAP               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>View the Contractor submittal for closure to verify the actions are completed. If applicable, the documents can be viewed via Pegasus if scanned and attached to the record.</li> <li>Review the causal analysis and proposed corrective action(s) for adequacy in resolving the Deficiency.</li> <li>Click the “Validate” button on the CAP data entry screen. If the CAP is acceptable, click the “CAP Validated” button. If the CAP is not acceptable, type a justification and click “CAP Rejected” button. This action will need to be communicated via the FPD/COR back to the Contractor.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is <b><u>never</u></b> the Issue Owner.</li> <li>This person is notified by Pegasus when a CAP is submitted for validation.</li> <li>To validate a CAP               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use the View Actions button on the CAP data entry screen or the Pegasus Navigation System to view the proposed corrective action(s)</li> <li>Review the causal analysis (if applicable) and proposed corrective action(s) for adequacy in resolving the Issue.</li> <li>Click the “Validate” button on the CAP data entry screen. If the CAP is acceptable, click the “CAP Validated” button. If the CAP is not acceptable, type a justification and click the “CAP Rejected” button. This action automatically advances the CAP to the next step in the process.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>
Management Validator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Responsible for the second tier validation of CAP’s. The Management Validator, typically a COR, should ensure that the CAP falls within the existing contract or represents an authorized contract modification. If the Management Validator selects a validation conclusion that differs from the Assigned Validator’s conclusion, the CAP remains unvalidated and is returned to the Assigned Validator’s queue for follow up with the applicable line manager.</li> <li>The Assigned Validator &amp; Management Validator can be the same manager, if desired.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Responsible for the second tier validation of CAP’s. The Management Validator, typically a COR, should ensure that the CAP falls within the existing contract or represents an authorized contract modification. If the Management Validator selects a validation conclusion that differs from the Assigned Validator’s conclusion, the CAP remains unvalidated and is returned to the Assigned Validator’s queue for follow up with the applicable line manager.</li> <li>The Assigned Validator &amp; Management Validator can be the</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To validate             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>View the Contractor submittal for closure to verify the actions are completed. If applicable, the documents can be viewed via Pegasus if scanned and attached to the record.</li> <li>Review the causal analysis and proposed corrective action(s) for adequacy in resolving the Deficiency.</li> <li>Click the “Validate” button on the CAP data entry screen. If the CAP is acceptable, click the “CAP Validated” button. If the CAP is not acceptable, type a justification and click “CAP Rejected” button. This action will need to be communicated via the FPD/COR back to the Contractor.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<p>same manager, if desired.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To validate             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use the View Actions button on the CAP data entry screen or the Pegasus Navigation System to view the proposed corrective action(s).</li> <li>Review the causal analysis and proposed corrective action(s) for adequacy in resolving the Issue.</li> <li>Click the “Validate” button on the CAP data entry screen. If the CAP is acceptable, click the “CAP Validated” button. If the CAP is not acceptable, type a justification and click “CAP Rejected” button. This action automatically advances the CAP to the next step in the process.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>
Validation Status	<p>For Contractor Deficiencies, this field will need to be updated once the Contractor CAP is submitted to DOE for approval. Assigned Validators shall update this field when the CAP is received from the contractor.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For Federal Weaknesses and Federal Deficiencies only: The Issues Owner is responsible for advancing the Corrective Action Plan (CAP) through the validation process as follows:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop a set of corrective action(s) to address the Issue, using Project, EMCBC and other resources as necessary.</li> <li>Enter the Actions in Pegasus using the “Add Action” button on the Issue or CAP data entry screen. (Note: the Actions will default to Draft status until the CAP is validated later.) Ensure the due dates are far enough away to allow time for CAP validation.</li> <li>When the appropriate Actions are entered, open the CAP data entry screen and set the status to “Pending Validation” (and Save). This will advance the CAP to the first step in the validation process. After that, Pegasus automatically advances the Status as the validation</li> </ol> </li> </ul>

		<p>process continues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Note that, since the Issue Owner is responsible for developing the CAP, they are <b><u>never</u></b> the Validator of the CAP or Verifier of Issue closure.</li> <li>• Issue Owners can add Actions to Federal Observations and even Federal Strengths, as desired. These actions do not require validation and are available to be “opened” and worked immediately.</li> </ul>
Responsible Organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Select the Project Line Management or EMCBC organization most interested in the Issue; generally, but not always, the Issue Owners organization. <b>NOTE:</b> For Contractor/Project Level CAP’s, this will always be the Project Line Management in order to route the CAP process correctly in Pegasus.</li> <li>• Pegasus uses this tag to determine which organizational Newspaper to display the CAP status to.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as Contractor Issue</li> </ul>

## 8.5 Action Management

8.5.1 Actions may be assigned as components of CAP’s, as a result of incoming correspondence or as stand-alone requirement(s) directed by line management.

8.5.2 A tutorial for writing and managing actions is available on the Pegasus “Help” Drop Down List.

8.5.3 Actions may be linked to the applicable CAP via the Pegasus menu.

## 9.0 RECORDS MAINTENANCE

The following documentation generated as a result of implementing this procedure will be processed when the assessment report is issued:

9.1 Corrective Action Report

9.2 Closeout Documentation

All records generated by this Procedure shall be prepared, maintained, and stored in accordance with IP-250-01, and individual Project/Organizational File Plans. In addition, all DOE records will conform to PS-243-01 and IP-243-04.



10.0 FORMS USED

10.1 None

11.0 ATTACHMENTS

11.1 Attachment A: Guidance for Writing Deficiencies

11.2 Attachment B: Guidance for Validating Corrective Actions

11.3 Attachment C: Guidance for Verifying Closure of Issues

11.4 Attachment D: Record of Revision

## ATTACHMENT A

### Guidance for Writing Deficiencies

Refer to the definition of a Deficiency in the “Definition” section of this procedure.

Documentation of performance deficiencies prepared by DOE must consider the functional aspects of the problems identified. Every effort should be made to document the deficiencies in a manner which (a) identifies all the germane aspects of the problem and (b) will result in correction and prevention of recurrence.

Several weaknesses that represent a potentially significant performance trend or a potential accident precursor may be issued as a Deficiency as deemed appropriate by the DOE Line Management. Further evaluation of performance should be considered when either the extent or significance of the identified problem is unclear.

Multiple symptoms or other indications of a performance problem should be grouped together into a single Deficiency that describes the overall performance problem.

Where the symptoms indicate that several different problems may exist, separate deficiencies should be prepared for each problem. Additional interaction with management or staff may be necessary to understand how best to describe the multi-aspect deficiencies. For example, during an observation of an operational evolution, operators were unable to follow procedures but continued with the evolution, resulting in a radioactive spill. This series of problems might be split into several individual deficiencies that will result in the identifying and correcting the causes of the several aspects such as:

- Why was the procedure inadequate; why did the procedure preparation, review and approval process fail?
- Why did the operators continue to perform the procedure and not follow protocols for such a case?
- Why did supervision fail to identify the problem and stop the operation?

The structure and content of the deficiencies may be reviewed with the Assessee between the time of the assessment and final publication of the report. Restructuring of deficiencies to optimize correction and prevention may occur at that time.

## ATTACHMENT B

### Guidance for Validating Corrective Action Plans

**CAP's should include all of the following:**

- A description of the cause of the deficiency (for other issue types, i.e. weaknesses, causal analysis is optional). Simple isolated problems may have readily evident direct causes while more complex matters may require use of more rigorous causal analysis techniques. For programmatic deficiencies, the CAP should include documentation of the cause(s) of the deficiency and a brief description of the deficient condition.
- Determination of the extent of the deficient condition
- Corrective actions that as a minimum:
  - Mitigate, in a cost effective manner, any unsafe, insecure, or deficient conditions that resulted from the existence of the deficiency.
  - Are based on the determination of credible direct and/or root causes. (A root cause analysis should be conducted).
  - Correct the deficiency and full extent of the condition.
  - Prevent recurrence of this and similar deficiencies.
  - Comply or restore compliance with applicable DOE Orders and/or other regulations.
  - Describe compensatory measures, if needed; and appropriately scheduled and prioritized.

NOTE: CAPs, which contain only actions for development of an action plan (i.e. a plan for a plan); shall not be accepted.

## ATTACHMENT C

### Guidance for Verifying Closure of Issues

**The purpose of Verification is to:**

- Verify completion of corrective actions at the point of use or implementation (i.e., to verify that the training, procedures, or other actions are being effectively executed “on-the-floor”);
- Evaluate whether, in the aggregate, the actions taken will be effective in the long term correction and prevention of recurrence; and
- Evaluate whether actions taken address the full extent of the deficient condition.

**Verification activities should include at least a sample of each of the following, as applicable:**

- A review of the objective evidence of the actions taken including:
  - Revisions to or new procedures;
  - Records of implementation of those procedures;
  - Changes to training programs; and
  - Records of implementation of the new training.
- Discussions with the workers and their respective supervisors to ensure training to implement the required changes have been effective.
- Observation of field activities that would demonstrate the effectiveness of the corrective and preventive actions, including procedure performance, training etc.
- A walk-through examination of affected equipment with focus on the effectiveness of corrective action implementation.

**EMCBC RECORD OF REVISION**

**DOCUMENT**

If there are changes to the controlled document, the revision number increases by one. Indicate changes by one of the following:

- I Placing a vertical black line in the margin adjacent to sentence or paragraph that was revised.
- I Placing the words GENERAL REVISION at the beginning of the text.

---

<b>Rev. No.</b>	<b>Description of Changes</b>	<b>Revision on Pages</b>	<b>Date</b>
1	Initial Procedure	All	1/14/08

PROCEDURE CHANGE REQUEST	
DATE: <u>11/16/07</u>	
INITIATOR: <u>Tim Marcus</u>	
INITIATOR PHONE NUMBER: <u>60477</u>	
DOCUMENT AFFECTED: <u>PD-414-03</u>	
SECTION: _____ PARAGRAPH #: _____	
IP NUMBER : _____ PARAGRAPH #: _____	
NEW IP: _____	
PROPOSED REVISION: <u>Initial Guide</u>	
_____	
_____	
JUSTIFICATION: _____	
_____	
_____	
_____	
Requested by: <u>Tim Marcus</u>	DATE: <u>11/16/07</u>
Approval: _____ Associate Director	DATE: _____
Assigned to: <u>Tim Marcus</u>	
DUE DATE: _____	

Document Review Record Sheet				
Document Title	<b>Pegasus Users Guide</b>			
IP Number PD-414-03	Revision No. 1	Date Issued for Review 11/16/07		
The subject document is being submitted for your review, approval or comments. Since this review is controlled, a response is required from all reviewers. Therefore, please return the review sheet with or without comments				
To: L. Chafin	Extension: 60461	By: 1/14/08		
Additional Instructions:				
Reviewer	Approve	Approve w/Comments	Do Not Approve	Signature of Reviewer
B. Fain				
M. Roy				
W. Best				
L. Schlag				
B. Nelson				
R. Holland				
T. Brennan				
R. Everson				
T. J. Jackson				
J. Craig				
Comments may be attached to a separate sheet of paper				
<b>APPROVE:</b> Signifies the reviewer's acceptance of the document issued for review.				
<b>APPROVE w/comments:</b> Signifies the reviewer's overall acceptance of the document regarding concept, practice, implementation, provisions and assigned responsibilities. However, the reviewer has suggestions as to the organization of its contents or helpful additions and/or deletions. These comments are termed "non-mandatory comments" and do not require formal resolution between the reviewer and preparer.				
<b>DO NOT APPROVE:</b> Signifies that the reviewer has identified significant problems regarding concept, practice, implementation or responsibilities that render the document unacceptable and/or not in conformance with stated requirements. Such problem areas must be clearly identified by the reviewer. It is mandatory for the preparer to resolve these comments with the reviewer document the resolution and obtain the reviewers concurrence for the resolution. The reviewer's written concurrence with the resultant change in disposition shall be documented on this form.				
General Review Comments:				
When review is delegated, the designated reviewer shall review and indicate concurrence with the designee's review comments and recommend disposition:				
Designated Reviewer	Concur	Do Not Concur	Signature	Date